

NATIONAL REVIEW

Bulletin

Jeeves for President?

p. 2

It's Official

p. 4

The Struelens Affair

p. 6

EDITOR: William F. Buckley Jr. PUBLISHER: William A. Rusher
EDITORS: L. Brent Bozell, James Burnham,
Willmoore Kendall, Frank S. Meyer, William F. Rickenbacker
MANAGING EDITOR: Priscilla L. Buckley

"The left," Professor Henry Kissinger of Harvard remarked a few years ago, "has pre-empted all the categories." He was right then, and today more right than ever. Discussions about almost any issue begin on the basis of what the Left has to say. Madame Khrushchev greeted the anti-nuclear youth marchers in Moscow the other day by drawing the essential distinction between the Soviet's explosion of a nuclear bomb and the West's explosion of a nuclear bomb. "Don't you understand," she said, "our bombs are for peace." Of course. The UN actually went so far as to pass an obsequious resolution begging the Soviet Union please, in the name of peace and a hygienic atmosphere, not to explode another bomb. Khrushchev thought the resolution a great joke, promptly exploded a behemoth bomb, and remarked kittenishly to the members of the 22nd Congress that actually it had gone well over the prescribed 50 megatons, but he did not intend to punish his scientists for the oversight. Eighteen months ago poor de Gaulle exploded a tiny little bomb in the Sahara and all the world was in turmoil, and the pacifists and collaborationists and Stakhanovite moralists went mad, literally mad with despair (Ghana terminated diplomatic relations with France)—but against Khrushchev, the protests are *pro forma*, empty of spirit or meaning. Granted, the Liberals can turn on the rhetoric, and so the *Washington Post* and the *New York Post* go through the motions, but the performance is empty: for

the fact of it is that the Left does what suits its purposes—that is the *given* in the international situation—and the world accepts its actions as the given in the international situation. All our own maneuvers are merely derivative, and defensive.

Said the Socialist *New Statesman* last week: "We . . . have a right and duty to criticize abuses of power in Ghana. But if such criticism is to retain its object, it must be made within a framework of sympathy and understanding."

Question. In dealing with Spain, should the *New Statesman* also criticize with sympathy and understanding? In dealing with the Dominican Republic? With South Africa? No, sympathy and understanding are what we show to the hard Left, period. What certified Liberal in the United States showed as much sympathy and understanding for Joe McCarthy as he shows for Frank Wilkinson? Or Willard Uphaus, or Owen Lattimore, or—Jagan, Touré, Nkrumah? There was never a clearer indication of the rewards of success. South Africa is censured by the United Nations for crimes which, set against the workaday monstrosities of the Soviet Union, reduce to peccadilloes. Ah—but if South Africa had the atom bomb, or controlled the fate of six hundred million people, then the diplomats and journalists and pundits would fawn upon Voerword. We are engaged in draining the moral content out of the war. Because we begin on the assumption that that which the Communists do is, when all is said and done, unassailable. The protests we do make are, for Khrushchev, strictly speaking, a laughing matter. He would not laugh if the Jeremiahs would, instead of merely ululating, come forward to propose, *e.g.*, an immediate economic boycott of the Soviet Union.

The WEEK

● A few thousand men went on strike, and New York City was deprived of milk. In a shortage, prices rose to the point where less efficient producers were attracted into the market. A few enterprising retailers started transporting milk to the city on their own and selling it at higher than normal prices. Mayor Wagner cried it was a bloody shame, and threatened to bruise the filthy entrepreneurs with any law he could lay his hands on—sanitation laws, fire laws—anything to keep the people from getting milk. It is a classic example of the people *v.* the unions: the people will buy milk at prices set by the unions, or they will not have milk at all, even if they're willing to pay a little more on the outside, which, in 18th-century slang, used to be called the free market.

● The Senate Internal Security Subcommittee has released the fourth in the series of hearings concerning the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. An investigation primarily of the Cleveland chapter, the testimony reveals the alignment of two groups which are traditionally antagonistic—the U. S. Communist Party, and the Socialist Workers

Party. Witness Tad Tekla, a pacifist who attended FPCC meetings, testified that he was aware of cooperation between the two groups in promoting the Fair Play for Cuba Committee. Richard Tussey, identified as chairman of the Cleveland chapter, took the Fifth Amendment and refused to acknowledge his chairmanship, or reveal whether or not he is a Communist. It is clear that the Fair Play for Cuba Committee has from the beginning been an orthodox Communist-front operation. We have the congressional investigating committee to thank for this valuable disclosure.

● Beginning in 1956, step by step and stage by stage, Khrushchev has tried to shake loose from the haunting ghost of his predecessor. He has taken the platform, at one congress after another, to denounce Stalin's crimes, his doctrine, his cult, his memory, and his allegedly continuing influence on such of the old companions as Molotov, Kaganovich and Malenkov, who have now become "the anti-Party group." And now he banishes Stalin's preserved flesh from his own and all men's sight. But the ghost does not die: for Khrushchev knows, as Molotov, Malenkov, Suslov, Kozlov, Mao and Tito and Hoxha all know, that it is in Khrushchev himself that Stalin's crimes, doctrine, cult, memory and influence still live; that Khrushchev is Stalin's heir, and never proved more fully heir than in the pathological (Out! out! damned flesh) ritual murder of Stalin's dead body.



Frankfurter Rundschau

● In East Germany, 19-year-old Peter Stefanski was sentenced to two and a half years in prison. His crime: traveling to West Berlin hospitals to donate blood.

● The German newspaper, *Die Welt*, reports that for more than a week the French Army warehouses in Algiers have been plundered—regularly, as if by concerted plan—of whole loads of paratroop uniforms, weapons, and miscellaneous equipment, presumably including plastic bombs: and the culprits are of the Secret Army Organization. Algerian authorities see in this a sign of imminent armed revolt. Any observer may see in it a sign that the keepers of the warehouses who allow regular nightly

forays by the Secret Army are themselves not far from joining the OAS. The Salan insurrection reaches deeper and deeper into the de Gaulle establishment.

Erratum: In the October 14, 1961 *Bulletin* we reported newspaper reports of a speech by Dean Eugene V. Rostow of the Yale Law School. Dean Rostow has supplied us with the full 36-page text of his address. We have studied it; he didn't say, exactly, what we said the newspapers said he said. We withdraw, with apologies.

Jeeves for President

John Kennedy had not yet taken the oath of President when NATIONAL REVIEW first ventilated the possibility that his high rhetoric and his promises of daring innovation might have been merely the tools by which a political technician had fashioned his campaign, and that those tools might be locked in the closet while the craftsman enjoyed his creation.

And thus it proved. Mr. Kennedy is working another bench now, with a different set of tools, but he remains the technician practicing his skill: shaping now the *being* President, rather than the becoming President. Which involves an ear most nicely tuned to the shifting resonances of public thought.

Early in the game, President Kennedy allowed his entourage to hint at some alternative to our continued opposition to admission of Red China into the UN. The public made its horror explicit, and by midsummer (too late, unfortunately, to halt the drive for recognition within the UN) the President returned to the right policy of utter opposition . . . Early in the game the President and his advisers talked gaily of incredible deficits, compensatory finance, a \$100-billion federal budget. The people made known their opposition (as did the European central banks at the recent Vienna conference of the International Monetary Fund)—and so, last week, even while the press began to estimate a \$10 billion deficit for the current fiscal year, the President announced a hard program of thrift and austerity in the government.

Laos was, in part, we were told, negotiable. After the Cuban fiasco and the roar of public shame, the President announced that South Vietnam would be defended—with American troops, if necessary. . . . After several months of mounting protest against the anti-business bias of his Administration, the President dispatched seven advisers to the meeting of the Business Council and sent high-level functionaries about the country, wooing business . . . The press remarked, with growing asperity, that the President had ignored the National Security Council and had called no cabinet meetings. Last week the President resumed contact with his Administration: and sat, with his cabinet, for a photograph, to prove it . . .

Virtually the entire power of the White House was placed behind the Multer bill, which would have repealed the gold reserve for our domestic currency: the House

Banking and Currency Committee was besieged with protests and requests to testify against the bill—and the Administration quietly abandoned the field . . . The Democratic Party waxed mutinous over the President's indifference to local political campaigns this fall. Last week, in a hasty reversal, the President got into the scraps in New Jersey, Texas, and elsewhere.

The White House is not occupied by a man of unalterable principle, but by a man who will balk at nothing—no, not even at right reason—in his desire for the continuing consent of the governed. Ladies and gentlemen, the President is at your service. When you want him, ring. Hold your hand on the buzzer for a bit. Sometimes he's a little hard of hearing.

Berlin is a Lever

The adventures of jeeps, escapees and tanks at the Great Wall of Khrushchev make the headlines, but the real meaning of the Berlin confrontation lurks in less spectacular dispatches. Confirming the fact revealed four weeks ago by *NR Bulletin*, public reports now estimate that since August 13—when the Communists sealed the East-West border—a weekly average of 1,700 West Berliners has been—defecting?—to West Germany. (A minimum figure: our figure was 2,000 weekly, and it may be more.) In Bonn the deadlock over composition of the new West German government is nearing the end of its second month.

There is no dodging the reason for the flight of the West Berliners. They are convinced that the West, by accepting the wall, capitulated on the Berlin issue. Nor has anything that has happened since August 13 contradicted their estimate. The full consequences of the surrender may be a long time coming. Still, 1,700 of them figure, weekly, that they had better get going while the going is good.

But the Berlin affair is in truth secondary. The basic crisis is not of Berlin but of Germany; and Germany, not Berlin, is the Kremlin's prime target. Khrushchev is using Berlin as a lever by which to pry West Germany loose from NATO and the West, and swing her back toward the East. He timed his summer blows to coincide with the West German election campaign. It is almost certain that the Berlin events—more particularly, the failure of the West to respond actively to Khrushchev's challenge—are at least part of the cause of the election losses of Konrad Adenauer's Christian Democrats, the increase for the Social Democrats and the doubling of the votes of Dr. Eric Mende's Free Democrats. The Christian Democrats are no longer a majority in the Bundestag. Dr. Mende, sensing a rising public support, has felt strong enough to hold out, in the bargaining over a coalition regime, for terms much beyond what the arithmetic alone would justify. Not only has he got a fat portion of posts for his party colleagues. He has compelled Adenauer to promise to resign within two years, and has pushed Adenauer's

PEOPLE: Sen. **John Stennis** (D., Miss.), once a big UN booster, now says United Nations finished as viable international political organization: suggests U.S. put its dependence on strengthened, expanded NATO organization. . . . Gov. **Donald G. Nutter** of Montana, who had temerity to proclaim Oct. 23 United States Day instead of United Nations Day, now accused of J . . . B . . . 'ism. . . . **Joseph Mitchell**, Newburgh's clean-up man, identifying himself in series of speeches with growing national conservative movement. . . . **Nelson Rockefeller's** demand that the U. S. resume atomic tests in the atmosphere (essential to development of anti-missile program) won him kudos from Midwestern conservatives. . . . Gen. **Walker** reportedly forced to dip deep into his savings in his fight with Pentagon.

Pope **John** expected to announce early next month election of a number of new cardinals, including one U. S., one Ceylonese and several in Latin America. . . . Cardinal **Mindszenty** reported in failing health in U. S. Legation in Budapest. . . . Albanian strongman **Enver Hoxha** sole survivor of Albanian Communist Party Central Committee of 1943. . . . Three opposition parties in Northern Bombay have joined to back tough anti-Communist **Acharya Kripalani** in his fight to unseat Indian Foreign Minister **Krishna Menon** in February elections. (If Menon loses, he can't stay in government). . . . Former French Premier **Pierre Mendès-France** in secret confab with Communist leader **Maurice Thorez** recently: presumably they discussed new united front now germinating in France. . . . **Eduardo Livas Villarreal**, newly elected governor of Mexican state of Nuevo León, has been member of Communist Party since 1946.

Gov. **Mark Hatfield**, Oregon's Liberal Republican leader, who was toying with idea of opposing **Wayne** (The Horse) **Morse** for the Senate in '62, more likely now to try for second term. . . . Former President **Eisenhower**, worried over growing conservative strength in GOP, would like to see his Defense Secretary, **Neil McElroy**, enter Ohio's gubernatorial race next year.

Ghana President **Kwame Nkrumah** has pushed through legislation setting up special courts empowered to mete out death penalty for political offenses. There will be no jury and no right of appeal from decision of the courts whose "troika" of judges is responsible directly to Nkrumah. . . . Brazilian papers, to emphasize fact that leftist President **Goulart**—theoretically a figurehead—is the real power in the country have taken to referring to **Tancredo Neves**, the Premier, as "premier" Neves.

Foreign Minister, Heinrich von Brentano, altogether out of the picture.

It is not that the Free Democrats are "pro-Communist" or "pro-Russian." Yet it is a historic fact that Konrad Adenauer has been the supreme symbol for Germany's postwar Western orientation. Von Brentano has been the lieutenant charged with putting that orientation into daily practice. The election returns, the repudiation of von Brentano and the semi-withdrawal of Adenauer thus express a movement—however embryonic—away from the West, and toward "independence" (neutralism?) if not yet the East. This significance is underlined by the further fact that among the supporters of the Free Democrats are some of the same social strata, even some of the same individuals, who favored the Hitler-Stalin rapprochement, and whose predecessors have for centuries believed that Germany's destiny lies with the East (*Drang nach Osten*).

The guardians of our national image might note that in international politics the old rule holds: Everybody loves a winner; and no one can afford for very long to stay close to a confirmed loser.

It's Official

The enterprising newsletter *Human Events* comes up with formal corroboration of what everyone really knew; that the professionals in the Republican Party prefer Goldwater to any other Presidential contender now in the public mind. *Human Events* wrote to every delegate and alternate to the 1960 Republican Convention to ask: Whom would you nominate if you were to meet tomorrow? The answer of the half (an unusually large segment) that replied: Goldwater, 49.3%; Nixon, 28.1%; Rockefeller, 16.3%.

That is very big news—not, as we say, because it is something a dispassionate observer could not have intuited, but because it cannot now be officially ignored that Senator Goldwater, by his responses to the great problems of the time, has become the most popular man in Republican politics and possibly in the country. The poll is known to have disturbed General Eisenhower, who now conceives it among his duties to see to it that Goldwater does not get control of the Republican Party. Simultaneously, Mr. Eisenhower is committed to fighting Kennedy for being too leftward, and Goldwater for being too far to the right. Presumably he is searching for a candidate as shapeless as himself. Mr. Eisenhower remains high in the general esteem. But he will learn what little effect he has in the making of the practical decisions of his Party when he tries to abort the Goldwater movement. Truman, four years after leaving the White House, tried to get Harriman nominated. The Convention yawned. Eisenhower is less skillful at this kind of thing than Truman was, and is not likely to do even as well.

But the principal challenge is to Senator Goldwater. He must during the next few months bring into his staff some professional President-makers (they are around, and

• At Home •

Washington

The massive anti-Communist demonstrations, whose reverberations are reaching Washington and will affect policy when Congress reconvenes, go on. The most spectacular to date was last week's affair in Los Angeles. Highlights came during strong speeches by Leon Skousen, author of *The Naked Communist* (he called for stiff action, including an ultimatum to the United Nations), and Senator Dodd and Congressman Judd. But what drew most notice here was the appearance of C. D. Jackson, right-hand man to Henry Luce, who was there to apologize publicly for *Life* magazine's assault on Dr. Fred Schwarz a few weeks ago. Jackson announced that it had been a mistake, for which the organization was truly sorry, and declared that *Life* was solidly behind the efforts of men like Walter Judd and Thomas Dodd to back strong anti-Communist policies. A few days later, Henry R. Luce made it official while receiving an award from the U. of Southern California. Time, Inc. is not given to apologizing. The pressures, it is assumed, must have been enormous, and they must have been genuine. Dr. Schwarz brought the meeting, in which several dozen Hollywood stars and writers who had opposed Communism over the years participated, to an end by promising to advance on Washington itself with his next rally. Question: will he have to import the anti-Communists?

For many months no one could figure out the President's opinion on UN admission for Red China—and maybe he couldn't. When Chester Bowles and Adlai Stevenson talked about "two Chinas" and "inevitability" in their Senate confirmation hearings, many—including a number of UN delegations that normally vote along with us—thought it the tip-off that JFK was ready to open the gate. Customers began climbing on the bandwagon. But one thing or another—the talks with Free China's Vice President Cheng, Khrushchev's general bad manners, a groundswell from the voters—suddenly made up the President's mind six weeks ago. The word went down: *Keep Red China out*. The President didn't quite say "positively"—which would have meant a decision to withdraw U.S. support from the UN if Peiping were seated. But he left no doubt about his wishes, for this year at any rate. It's a long trip, though, from cup to lip. As a Presidential decree staggers down the criss-crossed chains of command, it often gets twisted out of all recognition before it hits the operational level. Mr. Kennedy's blackball for Peiping looks a bit grey after handling by the White House staff and the State Department's Far Eastern and UN specialists, so many of them weaned on the Lattimore formula. (Speaking of

whom, does anyone really believe, in spite of his denials on returning last month, that Prof. Lattimore's summer safari to Outer Mongolia was purely coincidental?) And some UN heads of delegation can't help smiling when Ambassador Stevenson buttonholes them these days to insist that he didn't *really* mean "inevitable" when he said "inevitable" to the Senate last January.

At informal meetings around town, Republican congressmen and aides are discussing the mysterious failure of the President to look more convincing in meeting Moscow's offensive. What firmness he has shown in recent weeks, they all agreed, is the direct result of pressure from the grassroots. The invasion fiasco ignited a national resentment which propped Mr. Kennedy up into a stronger position on Berlin than he had been disposed to take. And it was directly responsible for his final decision, reached in July, to take strong measures to resist the entry of Red China into the United Nations. Early last spring the President told a group of newspapermen off the record that we were prepared to lose Laos and South Vietnam. He would make no such concession today concerning South Vietnam. But notwithstanding the improvement in his resolution, he gives the general appearance of feebleness and irrelevancy. The most conspicuous thing he did last week, for instance, while the Soviet Union was exploding a 50-megaton bomb, was to travel to New York and New Jersey, to campaign for Wagner and Hughes, and to Arkansas, to try to bail out Senator Fulbright.

Irrepressible optimists in the hard anti-Communist camp rejoiced, three weeks ago, when a White House press officer gave out the formula: "The President has decided, in principle, to send U.S. military units to Vietnam." When a general with a solid WW II combat record (instead of a Vice President) was ordered to the front, they started cheering. One of the lost souls who have abandoned all hopes but not their memories had this to say as the doubletalking communiqués came in from the Taylor-Rostow mission: "Maxwell Taylor did fine in North Africa, Salerno, Normandy and the Bulge, but don't forget that he was the man Truman sent to button up the Korean 'compromise' when Van Fleet was fired for expressing himself as unwilling 'to leave a war unfinished.' It was Taylor who forced General Gavin, a hard anti-Communist, out as chief of R & D, and Taylor who testified in 1959 that our nuclear strength was 'excessive to the requirements.' When he retired in June, '59, his first jump was to *Meet the Press*, where he spent his time in exclusive denunciation of ex-Secretary of Defense Charles Wilson and then Secretary Neil McElroy. From that moment on he was the ADA's favorite general—they don't have many they warm up to." QUINCY

don't care much whether they are working for a Democrat or a Republican—for them it is a profession). He must, if he is truly *presidentabili*, manage his time with ruthless economy, and identify himself in Congress with the broad conservative movement, giving especial encouragement to Republican growth in the South. He has much to do, but nothing that is beyond his powers.

BRIEFS: Look for major purge of Polish Communists who took "Gomulka line" in 1956, following breakup of 22nd Congress in Moscow. (Gomulka himself no longer a Gomulka-liner). . . . Called in at last moment to install massive heating and air conditioning plant in the huge new Congress Hall in Moscow in time for jamboree, several West German firms. (Certain comrades thought the air conditioning somewhat *de trop*.) . . . **Indian hunters irate at Khrushchev: they've been warned not to shoot wild ducks, pelicans, cranes now flying south into India from Central Asia, Siberia, radioactive all.** . . . Overlooked in fuss over the Big Bombs, a Soviet underwater nuclear explosion, part of its program to develop defensive devices against U. S. nuclear subs.

Welfare Secretary Ribicoff says U. S. now spending \$4 billion a year on relief payments. Nine out of ten Americans over 65 get money in one form or another from the government. . . . **The U. S. national debt, incidentally, is more than the total national debts of all other nations in the world combined.** . . . The Navy has awarded contract to Grumman aircraft to design a hydrofoil ship for anti-submarine warfare which would glide over the water at 50 knots (62 miles an hour). . . . Big winner from Cuban situation, the Philippines whose cigars are, to a large extent, replacing Havanas in U. S. market. . . . Nathaniel Weyl's *Red Star Over Cuba* (Spanish edition) running into trouble in Latin America: Communists and anti-U.S. agitators have threatened to throw bricks through windows of bookstores that display it. . . . **Italian Communist Party now recruiting skilled workers for Cuba, to replace those who have fled.** . . . Opinion Research Institute in Frankfurt reports that German public opinion has swung sharply from a 50-50 feeling of sympathy for France (in 1957) to a ratio of almost 4 to 1 in favor.

The People's Will Department (Near East Division): When the people of Syria, in a 1958 plebiscite, were asked to vote on union with Egypt the vote was—99.99%—for union.

NATIONAL REVIEW is published weekly by National Review, Inc. at 440 Post Road, Orange, Conn. (second class mail privileges authorized at Orange, Conn.). Copyright 1961 in the U.S.A. by National Review, Inc. All manuscripts, letters, subscription orders, changes of address and undeliverable copies should be sent to:

EDITORIAL AND CIRCULATION OFFICES
National Review
150 East 35th St., New York 16, N.Y.
Telephone ORegon 9-7330

RATES: \$15.00 a year (\$8.00 for the 36-page issues, and \$7.00 for the 8-page issues published on the alternate fortnights). The 8-page issues are available separately at \$10.00 a year. In all cases, add \$1.00 for Canada, \$2.00 for other foreign subscriptions.

• Trends •

The Struelens Affair

When United Nations troops attacked the anti-Communist bastion of Katanga, September 13, Western policy in Africa appeared to have reached a new low in masochistic folly. The invasion, subsidized and supported by the United States, sought to install one Egide Bochely-Davidson, an agent of the central Congolese government, as overlord of mineral-rich Katanga (which contains 60% of the world's cobalt).

That government is dominated by Vice Premier Antoine Gizenga, a pro-Communist trained in statecraft in Prague, Czechoslovakia. Bochely-Davidson himself, according to Senator Thomas Dodd (D., Conn.), has been reliably identified as "an agent of the Soviet Secret Police." Horrified anti-Communists had reason enough to condemn the action. The choice of Bochely-Davidson, a pro-Communist, an early and faithful supporter of the late Patrice Lumumba, was rightfully taken by President Tshombe to mean that the central government would settle for nothing less than unconditional surrender.

The *pièce de résistance*, however, was yet to come—a fillip of lunacy so exquisite as to make our run-of-the-mine foreign policy disasters seem brilliant by comparison. As UN troops battered Elisabethville, the Katanga government sought to marshal public support in the United States. It dispatched a man named Michel Struelens to New York City, as the director of "Katanga Information Services." Mr. Struelens issued various press materials about the UN action and, at the request of certain members of Congress, journeyed to Washington to confer with them about the crisis.

These efforts, apparently, were a source of deep annoyance to State Department diplomatists. Not satisfied with financing aggression against anti-Communist Katanga, they moved swiftly to dispose of Mr. Struelens.

On October 5, Struelens was summoned to the New York office of the Immigration and Naturalization Service, and there had his visa invalidated. He had, the State Department explained, engaged in "overactive" lobbying activities in Katanga's behalf. One spokesman blandly stated that Struelens had "received his visa as a newspaperman, not as an information officer." Struelens was held *persona non grata*, retroactive to September 26.

These arguments, it subsequently developed, were sheerest fiction. Struelens, as Senator Dodd has stated, "provided the press with documentary proof that when he obtained his first visa in Brussels in September 1960, the American Consul General in Brussels wrote under the visa in his own handwriting a notation to the effect that Mr. Struelens was coming to this country as Director of the Katanga Information Service at 609 Fifth Avenue, New York. This notation was repeated in the handwriting

of the American consul when Mr. Struelens renewed his visa in Brazzaville in August of this year."

The State Department nevertheless persisted in its misrepresentation. When Congressman Donald Bruce (R., Ind.) wired Foggy Bottom demanding an explanation, he was told Struelens "had been engaging in activities outside the clearly defined scope of the categories of the visa in his possession." Unfortunately for the State Department, Bruce had addressed another inquiry to the Department of Justice, asking the terms of Struelens' visa. He got this answer: "... The Katanga Information Services filed a registration statement with this Department on September 30, 1960. In that statement, Mr. Michel Struelens was named as the person in charge of the principal office. Mr. Struelens was identified as the Director General of Katanga Information Services, Elisabethville, and, the Justice spokesman added: "At this time, I am not aware of any violation of law which this Department would have cognizance by Mr. Struelens." This was written several weeks after the date given by the State Department for invalidation of Struelens' visa.

At this point, it became apparent that the State Department was up to no good in the Struelens episode.

On October 29, the American Civil Liberties Union entered the affray, saying the Department's action "clearly infringes on the constitutional principles of due process and freedom of speech."

ACLU Executive Director Patrick Murphy Malin, in a letter to Secretary of State Dean Rusk, condemned the Department for refusing Struelens a hearing, and for having told him it merely wanted to "look" at the visa, when it called him in to have it cancelled. "We believe and urged," Malin concluded, "that the State Department should demonstrate its firm belief in [the] essentials of human liberty by rescinding its cancellation of Michel Struelens' visa, or issuing him a new one." Undaunted, the State Department has moved on to a second argument—that the United States doesn't recognize Katanga, and therefore should not countenance the presence of a Katanga press representative. Oddly enough, this logic has not been invoked against the Information Officer for the Algerian rebels, who also operates out of New York. Nor has State Department zeal for virtue been expanded to include Soviet-bloc correspondents, who function on our shores blissfully unharassed by U. S. officialdom.

Such blatant contradictions provide an intriguing topic for inquiry and meditation. Senator Dodd, in fact, finds them so intriguing he plans an investigation of the Struelens' case, and of our policy toward Katanga generally, by the Senate Internal Security Subcommittee.

With sufficient public support, he may succeed in discovering why those entrusted with the defense of America against Communism are so deviously engaged in persecuting an anti-Communist ally.

M. STANTON EVANS

• Abroad •

Léopoldville. From David Holden's dispatch to moderately leftist *Manchester Guardian Weekly* (Oct. 19): "... Parliament has now been in session . . . for the last two months and has accomplished nothing. Its deliberations—if such a term can be applied to its diffuse palavers—remain principally concerned with personal, family, or tribal aggrandizement, interspersed with parrot noises about colonialism and imperialism and the valiant struggle of the Congolese people. . . . The trappings of democracy remain exactly that—alien institutions in a tribal society. . . . [Independence] was simply handed to [the Congolese] on a plate in a form totally unsuited to Congolese realities. . . . Spending will probably continue to exceed revenue in the proportion of three or four to one. . . . This is not simply due to the loss of Katanga. . . . A sickening financial irresponsibility cripples the whole country, based on the assumption . . . that political freedom must mean more cash, cars, and concubines. Those in authority have made sure that they got them. One estimate suggests that as much as a third of the entire national income is devoted now to paying the wages of the Government and the Army. . . . Political appointees have managed to raise their own emoluments by over 400%. Ordinary parliamentary deputies can and do . . . make £400 or £500 a month, tax-free. . . ."

Nairobi. Jomo Kenyatta, chief of the Mau Mau, has agreed, after keeping his courtiers waiting for three months following his release from detention, to accept leadership of KANU, Kenya's largest political party. It is expected that within the next few weeks, Britain will remove the last legal hindrance to his re-entry into full political activity. The day when Kenyatta will become chief, also, of the Kenya government is not far off.

Elisabethville. A key element of the late Dag Hammarskjöld's design for wrecking the Katanga regime is systematic slander of "white mercenaries." A few facts begin to pierce the UN curtain. In a letter printed by the *New York Times* (Oct. 28), California Professor Daniel J. Crowley identified Katanga's "secret" one-man air force as an old friend of his, of Walloon parentage: Joseph Delin, a moderately left-wing engineer and small businessman long resident in Katanga, a believer in African rule, known for his practical as well as theoretic acceptance of racial equality. A number of veterans (or "dregs," as Mr. H. called them) of the Algerian civil war have also been recently identified, most of them with impressive records extending back into the anti-Nazi Resistance: Captain de La Bourdonnaye, Commandant Roger Faulk, Captains Heltzen and Egey. Shortly after Congolese independence, Commandant Faulk, an expert in guerrilla and subversive warfare, advised Moïse Tshombe: "Sooner or later the UN will attack you. Disperse your forces, your food supplies and your arms in small villages. Be ready to fight a guerrilla-style war

in the bush, to make commando raids and to lay ambushes. You are not strong enough to risk open battle against their equipment." Faulk taught his men never to maneuver without a covering force of thirty or forty commandos. While these immobilized UN tanks and armored cars, Faulk's specialists mounted shock operations with formidable speed, and achieved remarkable success.



Conakry, Guinea. Following Sekou Touré's announcement two months ago of the Africanization of the Catholic Church in Guinea, the French members of the clergy are being rapidly expelled, beginning with the primate, Archbishop de Milleville, and including ancient priests who have spent their entire working lives in Guinea. The civil authorities have taken over all primary and secondary schools. Even the small Conakry seminary has been nationalized, and its students, who had started the autumn terms September 1, sent home—thus suggesting that the anti-Church moves are to include the native clergy also. Touré refuses even to discuss Church relations except with an African (sc., Negro).

Florence. In its attitude toward "the new Africa," the Italian Left is developing the obsessive inverted racism of our epoch along imaginative lines. At the Mediterranean Cultural Congress, the official host, Signor La Pira, Florence's famous Poor Man Mayor, declared that God has entrusted to the Negro race the task of purifying human civilization, cutting away its dead and diseased branches, and introducing spiritual beauty and light, religious revival and poetic feeling. The social-democratic newspaper, *Avanti!*, announces that the "temples of spirit worship" destroyed in Africa "under the blows of colonizers and slave merchants" were the equal of Europe's Gothic cathedrals; and the fifteenth- and sixteenth-century bronzes found in the ruins of Benin, "unquestionably" of the same aesthetic level as European art works of the same period (i.e., as the works of Donatello, Leonardo, Michelangelo, Titian . . .). A German scholar is quoted to prove that the Africans didn't invent writing because they had the tom-tom, a superior medium of communication.

• The Investor •

The Management

Emotional reactions of investors, be they neophytes or sophisticates, are the same. The sophisticate differs only in that experience has taught him to mistrust his first impulses, however strong. Fear can be made a useful investment tool. It can lead to thorough investigation before a purchase or a sale. It can also father investment hedging against unexpected contingencies.

More often fear proves a handicap. It drives investors to sell after a prolonged decline and to buy after long-continued price advance. The cult of "chartism," total reliance on price change as a guide, tends to accentuate market advances and declines.

Most investors, it seems, tend to believe that any trend, up or down, will persist. Without intensive knowledge of a company, its management, and the factors which will make it prosper or fail, one is likely to become alarmed by adverse market action and to be lulled into euphoria by advances.

For the sophisticate, a significant decline in the market price of a holding means a reinvestigation of the premises upon which he made his investment. Has management deteriorated? Has the company merely run into one of the many temporary setbacks practically every company experiences?

Observation of how management handles obstacles can be very helpful in appraising management capability. A company management which meets obstacles successfully demonstrates an ability to cope with future problems. Any company which enjoys uninterrupted success over a period of years may develop weaknesses which are not apparent. Witness some electronic stocks recently.

The aero-space industry provides examples of how careful examination of company setbacks reveals significant management deterioration or strength. Long personal familiarity with the aero-space industry, known until recently as the airplane manufacturing industry, leads me to use it as an illustration.

Ownership of shares in one airplane manufacturing company over a span of 14 years, until 1957-58, had proven remunerative. At that time management changes became so disturbing that we decided to eliminate our own and our clients' holdings. We made this decision despite the fact that this company's shares then enjoyed the highest investor acceptance in the industry.

Subsequent developments more than justified our apprehensions. Today the company is obviously in serious difficulty, and has passed its dividend. A long succession of both high and low-level management resignations and firings has impaired the morale of the organization. The history of similar management disintegrations indicates that it will take five years or more to repair such damages.

This is not the only airplane manufacturing company management to suffer serious deterioration. Another industry leader for decades began a decline in 1947 and it has progressed downward slowly ever since. While less dramatic than the first example, investors who failed to comprehend the direction of management change, have serious losses today.

Purchase of shares in this company, merely because they are down in price, is not intelligent. While present management remains in control, well-managed competitors will outstrip it. Rebuilding a company is usually a long and arduous process.

I do not consider it a matter of luck that we determined in 1956, 1957 and 1958 that Boeing had the leading management and organization in the industry. Anyone who examines the price record of Boeing stock following those years will discover that market action did not confirm our judgment at once. Quite the reverse. Investor evaluation of quality changes slowly and often considerably after the fact of management deterioration.

Part of the reasons lay in the decision of the Boeing management to meet its problems head on. Its commercial jet programs meant large development and tooling expenditures. These were largely charged off as incurred. The need for cash to carry large inventory for jets in process of manufacture was met realistically in 1956 by a dividend cut from the \$2.00 per share rate to \$1.00. Sixty per cent of the dividend was restored last November.

Two competitors in the commercial aircraft field refused to recognize their situation by either write-off or dividend cutbacks. Both subsequently took huge deferred write-downs and eliminated dividend payments.

Had an investor judged managements by the market action of company shares in the years 1956-1960, and many did, Boeing would have been sold at perhaps half its current price.

Today the Boeing Company's superior management is receiving somewhat belated recognition. One of our largest investment trusts has just completed a major purchase of its shares. This follows upon earlier purchase by two other investment trusts. Since purchase by a few trusts often sets off a buying chain reaction, it would not be surprising if further trust purchases take place.

Since Boeing's stock today sells at a modest 11 to 12 times estimated (\$4.50 per share) earnings for this year, there is plenty of room for higher prices based on greater recognition of quality.

The examples cited are not meant to suggest infallibility. They have been discussed to show that considerable knowledge of managements is essential: it can give one the confidence to hold on through adversity when that is the right course and it can also induce sufficient apprehension to sell at a time when the marketplace still appraises a company highly.

Price change as the sole criterion for stock purchase or sale will never prove an adequate substitute for knowledge of a company and its management.

NORVIN R. GREENE

